

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 4-14, 16-18, and 20 were pending. Claims 16 and 20 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 4, 5, 7-9, 12, 14, and 18 have been amended. Claims 4-14, and 17-18 remain pending.

### Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claim 5 has been amended to become an independent claim incorporating all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, claim 5 as amended is now allowable. Claim 6 has been amended to depend from the allowable claim 5. Thus, claim 6 as amended is now allowable. The base claim of claim 6, i.e., claim 4, has been amended to incorporate all of the limitations of claim 6. Thus, claim 4 as amended is now allowable. The base claim of claim 9, i.e., claim 7, has been amended to incorporate all the limitations of claim 9. Thus, claim 7 as amended is now allowable. Claim 8 has been amended to become an independent incorporating all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, claim 8 as amended is now allowable. Claim 9 as amended depends from the allowable claim 8, and hence, claim 9 as amended is now allowable. The base claim of claim 11, i.e., claim 7, is now allowable, and thus, claim 11 is now allowable. The base claim of claim 16, i.e., claim

12, has been amended to incorporate all of the limitations of claim 16. Thus, claim 12 as amended is now allowable. Applicant respectfully submits that the objection on claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 16 have been overcome by the amendments and allowance is earnestly solicited.

### 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 7, 10, 12-14, 17, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Bryan et al. (US 6,552,582) in view of Tinsley et al. (US 2003/0085736). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections on claims 17 and 18.

Claim 17 recites “amplifying the plurality of input voltages using a plurality of **inverters**” (Claim 17, line 8; emphasis added). In contrast, neither Bryan nor Tinsley teaches amplifying the plurality of input voltages using a plurality of inverters. In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that claim 17 corresponds to the circuit already discussed similarly with regard to claim 4. However, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 (as it previously stood before the current amendments are entered) does not recite a plurality of inverters. Furthermore, neither Bryan nor Tinsley discloses, suggests, or implies a plurality of inverters. Therefore, claim 17 is patentable over Bryan in view of Tinsley. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 18 as amended sets forth the limitations of:

the means for generating the plurality of differential low swing signals using the low swing differential pre-driver comprises:  
means for supplying current to a load from a second current source;

means for sinking the current from the load via a transistor and a resistor, the transistor being coupled to the resistor in parallel; and  
means for outputting a plurality of low swing differential signals via the load to the gates of the plurality of pull-down transistors.  
(Claim 18, lines 9-20).

In contrast, neither Bryan nor Tinsley teaches the limitations set forth above. Bryan discloses a source follower circuit for low voltage differential signaling (LVDS) (Bryan, Abstract; Figure 2). Tinsley discloses a driver circuit in a LVDS transceiver device (Tinsley, Figure 5). Neither Bryan nor Tinsley discloses, suggest, or implies means for supplying current to a load from a second current source, means for sinking the current from the load via a transistor and a resistor, the transistor being coupled to the resistor in parallel, and means for outputting a plurality of low swing differential signals via the load to the gates of the plurality of pull-down transistors. Therefore, claim 18 as amended is patentable over Bryan in view of Tinsley. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 20 has been canceled without prejudice, thus obviating the rejection on claim 20.

Claims 4, 7, and 12 as amended are allowable for the reason discussed above with respect to the allowable subject matter. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 13-14 depend from claims 7 and 12, respectively. Thus, having additional limitations, claims 10 and 13-14 are patentable over Bryan in view of Tinsley for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claims 7 and 12. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Teresa Wong at (408) 720-8300.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), Applicant hereby requests and authorizes the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date:

1/9/2006

C72-8

Chui-Kiu Teresa Wong  
Reg. No. 48,042

Customer No. 008791  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030  
(408) 720-8300